

WEAK SOLUTIONS OF STOCHASTIC RECURSIONS: AN EXPLICIT CONSTRUCTION

P. MOYAL

ABSTRACT. We propose an explicit construction of the solution of a stationary stochastic recursion of the form $X \circ \theta = \varphi(X)$ on a semi-ordered Polish space, when the monotonicity of φ is not assumed. This solution exists on an enriched probability space (it is said *weak*), provided the recursion is lattice-valued, and dominated by a proper monotonic stochastic recursion.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a Polish space that is endowed with a partial ordering $\preceq$. We assume that $\mathcal{E}$ admits a minimal point denoted by $0_{\mathcal{E}}$, and is such that any $\preceq$ -increasing sequence converges (possibly to some element of the adherence of $\mathcal{E}$). Any subset $A \subset \mathcal{E}$ is said *locally finite* if for any compact subset $C \subset \mathcal{E}$, $A \cap C$ is of finite cardinal. Let $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}^*$ denote the sets of integers, of non-negative integers and of positive integers, respectively.

Consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ is Polish, furnished with the measurable bijective flow θ (denote θ^{-1} , its measurable inverse). Suppose that $\mathbf{P}$ is stationary and ergodic under θ , *i.e.* for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{P}[\theta^{-1}\mathcal{A}] = \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}]$ and all $\mathcal{A}$ that is θ -invariant (*i.e.* such that $\theta\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$) is of probability 0 or 1. Note that according to these axioms, all θ -contracting event (such that $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}^c \cap \theta^{-1}\mathcal{A}] = 0$) is of probability 0 or 1. We denote for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta^n = \theta \circ \theta \circ \dots \circ \theta$ and $\theta^{-n} = \theta^{-1} \circ \theta^{-1} \circ \dots \circ \theta^{-1}$. Except when explicitly mentionned, throughout all the r.v. are defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$.

We denote $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ the set of mappings from $\mathcal{E}$ into itself. For any $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ -valued r.v. F , for any $x \in \mathcal{E}$, let $F_{\omega}(x)$ be the image of x through F for the sample ω . For any $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$, and any subset $B \subset \mathcal{E}$, we denote $f(B) = \{f(x); x \in B\}$, and accordingly for any $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ -valued r.v. F and all sample ω , $F_{\omega}(B) = \{F_{\omega}(x); x \in B\}$.

Let φ be a $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ -valued r.v.. For all $\mathcal{E}$ -valued r.v. X , let $\{X_{X,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the $\mathcal{E}$ -valued *stochastic recursive sequence* (SRS for short) initiated by X and driven by φ , *i.e.*, such that **P**-a.s.,

$$\begin{cases} X_{X,0} &= X; \\ X_{X,n+1} &= \varphi \circ \theta^n(X_{X,n}), \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Define for all sample ω , all n and $x \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\Phi_{\omega}^n(x) = X_{x,n}(\theta^{-n}\omega) = \varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega} \circ \varphi_{\theta^{-2}\omega} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\theta^{-n}\omega}(x).$$

We investigate the existence of a stationary version of the sequence $\{X_{X,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, *i.e.* such that $X_{X,n} = X \circ \theta^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it is easily seen that the r.v. X solves

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary : 60F17, Secondary : 60K25 and 60B12.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic recursions, Stationary solutions, Enriched probability space, Markov chains.

the *stochastic recursive equation* (SRE for short):

$$(1) \quad X \circ \theta = \varphi(X).$$

The existence of a solution to this functional equation on the original probability space is not granted in general, without further assumptions on φ , such as monotonicity and continuity (as assumed by Loynes' theory). We propose in this paper a technique alternative to that of renovating events (see [4]) for solving (1) in a more general context. More precisely, we aim to construct an extension of the probability space, on which the existence of the solution is granted. The main assumption that will be used here is the domination of the original SRE by a proper one, in a certain sense. We assume throughout that

(H1) *For some $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ -valued r.v. ψ ,*

- *for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$,*

$$\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{E}} \preceq \varphi(x) \preceq \psi(x), \mathbf{P} - a.s.;$$

- *ψ is $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. $\preceq$ -non decreasing;*
- *the SRE*

$$(2) \quad Y \circ \theta = \psi(Y)$$

admits at least one $\mathcal{E}$ -valued solution.

2. EUCLIDIAN CASE: EXISTENCE RESULT

Throughout this section, we assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is the euclidian space $\mathbb{R}^n$, where $n \geq 1$, equipped with the coordinatewise ordering " $\preceq$ ". The domination by a proper SRE (Hypothesis **(H1)**) is a key argument for applying Anantharam and Konstantopoulos's results (see [1, 2]): the tightness of the dominated sequence is then easily obtained, and guarantees the existence of an extension of the original probability space, on which a solution to (1) exists.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that **(H1)** holds, that*

(H2) *ψ is $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. continuous,*

and that either one of the two following conditions holds:

(H3) *φ is $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. continuous;*

(H4) *φ admits $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. a countable number of discontinuities, and there exists a locally finite subset $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{E}$ that includes $\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{E}}$ and that is $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. stable by φ .*

Then, there exists an extension $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbf{P}}, \bar{\theta})$ of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \theta)$, that is such that

- *$\bar{\mathbf{P}}$ is a $\bar{\theta}$ -invariant probability on $\bar{\Omega}$ having Ω -marginal $\mathbf{P}$,*
- *there exists a $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ -valued r.v. $(\bar{X}, \bar{\varphi})$ defined on $\bar{\Omega}$ such that the Ω -marginal of $\bar{\varphi}$ is the distribution of φ , and such that*

$$\bar{X} \circ \bar{\theta} = \bar{\varphi}(\bar{X}), \bar{\mathbf{P}} - a.s..$$

Proof. This result is a consequence of Theorem 1 in [1], whose hypothesis are corrected in [2]. The tightness of the embedded SRS (implied by the domination assumption **(H1)**) is the key argument. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the Borel sigma-field on $\mathcal{E}$, and define

- $\bar{\Omega} := \Omega \times \mathcal{E}$,
- $\bar{\mathcal{F}} := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{I}$,

- for all $(\omega, x) \in \bar{\Omega}$,

$$\bar{\theta}(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, \varphi_\omega(x)).$$

It is an immediate consequence of Loynes' Theorem for stochastic recurrences ([7, 3]) that under assumption **(H2)**, there exists a solution, say Y_∞ , to (2). The r.v. Y_∞ is given by the a.s. limit of the sequence $\{Y_{0_\varepsilon, n} \circ \theta^{-n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Note, that Y_∞ may in general be improper (i.e. valued in some $\bar{\mathcal{E}} \supset \mathcal{E}$). However, Y_∞ is $\preceq$ -minimal among all the solutions of (2), and the last assertion of Hypothesis **(H1)** entails that Y_∞ is $\mathcal{E}$ -valued.

In particular, the sequence $\{Y_{0_\varepsilon, n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ tends weakly to Y_∞ . It is thus tight (Prohorov's Lemma): for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_{0_\varepsilon, n} \preceq M_\varepsilon] \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

In view of the first assertion of Hypothesis **(H1)**, an immediate induction shows that

$$X_{0_\varepsilon, n} \preceq Y_{0_\varepsilon, n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{P} - \text{a.s.},$$

so that

$$\mathbf{P}[X_{0_\varepsilon, n} \preceq M_\varepsilon] \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which shows the tightness of the sequence $\{Y_{0_\varepsilon, n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Remark that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\mathbf{P} \otimes \delta_{0_\varepsilon} [\bar{\theta}^{-n}(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{E})] = \mathbf{P}[\theta^{-n}\mathcal{A}] = \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}]$$

and

$$\mathbf{P} \otimes \delta_{0_\varepsilon} [\bar{\theta}^{-n}(\Omega \times \mathcal{B})] = \mathbf{P} \otimes \delta_{0_\varepsilon} \left[\left\{ (\omega, x) \in \bar{\Omega}; X_{x, n}(\omega) \in \mathcal{B} \right\} \right] = \mathbf{P}[X_{0_\varepsilon, n} \in \mathcal{B}].$$

Hence, the probability distributions $\left\{ (\mathbf{P} \otimes \delta_{0_\varepsilon}) \circ \bar{\theta}^{-n} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $\bar{\Omega}$ have Ω -marginal $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ -marginals, the distributions of $\{X_{0_\varepsilon, n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which form a tight sequence. The sequence $\left\{ (\mathbf{P} \otimes \delta_{0_\varepsilon}) \circ \bar{\theta}^{-n} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is thus tight, which is the first condition of Theorem 1 in [1].

We now have to check that either one of the conditions (A1)-(A3) p.271-272 of [2] holds in order to apply Theorem 1 in [1]. First, under condition **(H3)**, the shift θ is continuous from $\Omega \times \mathcal{E}$ into itself, which is condition (A1) in [2].

Let us now assume that **(H4)** holds. Fix $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and a sample ω . Denote $\mathcal{D} = \{D_{\omega, j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_\omega}$, the set of discontinuities of φ_ω (note that $\mathcal{J}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. countable by hypothese). For all $j \in \mathcal{J}_\omega$, let $C_{\omega, p, j}$ be some point of $\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$d(D_{\omega, j}, C_{\omega, p, j}) = 2^{-p},$$

$\mathcal{B}_{\omega, p, j}$ be the bowl of center $C_{\omega, p, j}$ and radius 2^{-p} and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\omega, p} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}_\omega} \mathcal{B}_{\omega, p, j}.$$

There exists a continuous function $\varphi_{\omega, p}$ from $\mathcal{E}$ into itself, such that $\varphi_{\omega, p}$ coincides with φ_ω outside the open set $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, p}$. Finally, define the shift θ_p for all $(\omega, x) \in \bar{\Omega}$ by

$$\bar{\theta}_p(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, \varphi_{\omega, p}(x)),$$

so that $\bar{\theta}_p$ is continuous from $\bar{\Omega}$ into itself. It is clear from **(H4)** that for all $i \geq 1$, $\Phi^i(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{E}}) \in \mathcal{L}$, $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s., so that

$$\mathbf{P}[\Phi^i(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{E}}) \in \mathcal{B}_p] \leq \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{B}_p \neq \emptyset].$$

Set

$$\mathcal{U}_p = \{(\omega, x) \in \bar{\Omega}; x \in \mathcal{B}_{\omega, p}\}.$$

Then, $\mathcal{U}_p$ is an open subset of $\bar{\Omega}$, and in view of the latter inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mathbf{P} \otimes \delta_x) \circ \bar{\theta}^{-i}(\mathcal{U}_p) &= \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{P}[\Phi^i(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{E}}) \in \mathcal{B}_p] \\ &\leq \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{B}_p \neq \emptyset] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{L}$ is a locally finite set. Therefore, the last assumption of Theorem 1 of [1] is verified (see [2] for the additional assumption (A3), p.272). We can therefore apply this result, yielding that there exists a $\bar{\theta}$ -invariant probability $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ whose Ω -marginal is $\mathbf{P}$. Define now on $\bar{\Omega}$ the random variables

$$\bar{X}(\omega, x) := x, \quad \bar{\varphi}_{\omega, x} := \varphi_{\omega}.$$

We then have that

$$(3) \quad \bar{X} \circ \bar{\theta}(\omega, x) = \varphi_{\omega}(x) = \bar{\varphi}_{\omega, x}(x) = \bar{\varphi}_{\omega, x}(\bar{X}(\omega, x)), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \text{a.s.},$$

hence $\bar{X}$ is a proper solution to (1) on $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \bar{\theta})$. $\square$

3. EXPLICIT CONSTRUCTION

In some cases, the extension, on which a solution to (1) exists, can be explicitly construct. For doing so, we follow an argument related to that developped by Flipo ([5]) and Neveu ([8]) for the SRS describing the workload of a loss queueing system $G/G/1/1$.

Additionally to Hypothesis **(H1)**, let us assume throughout this section that the following assumption holds.

(H5) *For some subset $\mathcal{K}$ of $\mathcal{E}$ that is stable by φ , for some $\mathcal{E}$ -valued solution Y to (2), the set $\mathcal{G}_{\omega} = \{x \in \mathcal{K}; x \preceq Y(\omega)\}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. non empty and of finite cardinal.*

Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K})$ denote the power-set of $\mathcal{K}$. In the sequel, Y denotes an arbitrary $\mathcal{E}$ -valued solution to (2) satisfying assertion **(H5)**.

Let us fix a sample $\omega \in \Omega$, an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $x \in \mathcal{K}$. First, it is easily seen by induction that $\Phi^n(x) \in \mathcal{K}$ $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. Now define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{\omega}^n &:= \mathcal{G}_{\theta^{-n}\omega} = \{x \in \mathcal{K}; x \preceq Y \circ \theta^{-n}\omega\}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{\omega}^n &:= \Phi_{\omega}^n(\mathcal{G}_{\omega}^n). \end{aligned}$$

The random set $\mathcal{H}^n$ then represents the set of all possible values of the recursion driven by φ at 0, when letting the the value at $-n$ vary over the (a.s. finite and non empty - see **(H5)**) set of elements of $\mathcal{K}$ that are majorized by $Y \circ \theta^{-n}$. We have that

Lemma 1. *The sequence of random sets $\{\mathcal{H}^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a.s. decreasing for the inclusion.*

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then, we have a.s. for all $x \in \mathcal{H}_\omega^{n+1}$, that for some $y \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^{n+1}$,

$$(4) \quad x = \Phi_\omega^{n+1}(y) = \Phi_\omega^n(\varphi_{\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega}(y)).$$

On the one hand, since $y \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^{n+1}$, $y \in \mathcal{K}$ and hence

$$(5) \quad \varphi_{\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega}(y) \in \mathcal{K}.$$

On the other hand, $y \preceq Y(\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega)$. Hence, in view of (H2), the a.s. monotonicity of ψ and the fact that Y is a solution to the functional equation (2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega}(y) &\preceq \psi_{\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega}(y) \preceq \psi_{\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega}\left(Y\left(\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega\right)\right) \\ &= Y \circ \theta\left(\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega\right) = Y(\theta^{-n}\omega), \end{aligned}$$

which means with (5) that $\varphi_{\theta^{-(n+1)}\omega}(y) \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^n$. Hence, $x \in \mathcal{H}_\omega^n$, which concludes the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

It then follows from the fact that the random sets $\mathcal{H}^n$, $n \geq 1$ are a.s. non-empty and of finite cardinal, that

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{H}_\omega := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_\omega^n \neq \emptyset, \mathbf{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

Moreover,

Lemma 2. *The r.v. Card $\mathcal{H}$ is deterministic.*

Proof. Fix $n \geq 1$. We have a.s. that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}^{n+1} &= \left\{ \Phi_{\theta\omega}^{n+1}(x); x \in \mathcal{K} \cap \left\{ y \in \mathcal{E}; y \preceq Y\left(\theta^{-(n+1)} \circ \theta\omega\right) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \Phi_{\theta\omega}^{n+1}(x); x \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^n \right\} = \left\{ \varphi_\omega\left(\Phi_\omega^n(x)\right); x \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^n \right\} = \varphi_\omega\left(\mathcal{H}_\omega^n\right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies in particular that $\text{Card } \mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}^{n+1} \leq \text{Card } \mathcal{H}_\omega^n$, $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Letting n go to infinity, this implies that $\text{Card } \mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega} \leq \text{Card } \mathcal{H}_\omega$, which concludes the proof in view of the ergodicity of $\mathbf{P}$ under θ . $\square$

On another hand, we have the following property.

Lemma 3. *The mapping φ_ω is bijective from $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ to $\mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}$, $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.*

Proof. The following assertions hold on a $\mathbf{P}$ -almost sure event. Let $x \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$. In other words, $x \in \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_\omega^n$, which amounts in turn to say that for any $n \geq 1$, for some $y_n \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^n$, $x = \Phi_\omega^n(y_n)$. We therefore have that

$$\varphi_\omega(x) = \varphi_\omega \circ \varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\theta^{-n}\omega}(y_n) = \Phi_{\theta\omega}^{n+1}(y_n),$$

where $y_n \in \mathcal{G}_\omega^n = \mathcal{G}_{\theta\omega}^{n+1}$. This is true for all $n \geq 1$, hence $\varphi_\omega(x)$ belongs to the set

$$\bigcap_{n \geq 2} \Phi_{\theta\omega}^n(\mathcal{G}_{\theta\omega}^n) = \bigcap_{n \geq 2} \mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}^n = \mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega},$$

so that φ_ω maps $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ onto $\mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}$.

Now, to check that φ_ω is surjective, fix $y \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}$. For any $n \geq 1$, for some $x_n \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta\omega}^n$, we have that $y = \Phi_{\theta\omega}^n(x_n) = \varphi_\omega(z_n)$, where

$$z_n = \varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\theta^{-(n-1)}\omega}(x_n).$$

Therefore, φ_ω is bijective from $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ into $\mathcal{H}_{\theta\omega}$ since these two sets have the same cardinal (Lemma 2). $\square$

Explicit construction of the extension. We propose now an enrichment of the original probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \theta)$ on which a solution to (1) can be constructed. Denote by c , the almost sure cardinal of the set $\mathcal{H}$.

Proposition 1. *The quadruple $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{\theta})$ defines a stationary dynamical system:*

- $\tilde{\Omega} = \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{E}; x \in \mathcal{H}(\omega)\};$
- $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \left\{ \mathcal{A} \cap \tilde{\Omega}; \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}) \right\};$
- For all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}] &= \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \text{Card } \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{B}] \\ &= \frac{1}{c} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}(\omega)}(y) \right) d\mathbf{P}(\omega); \end{aligned}$$

- For all $\omega \in \Omega, x \in \mathcal{K}, \tilde{\theta}(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, \varphi_{\omega}(x)).$

Proof. To check this, first remark that $\tilde{\theta}$ defines an automorphism of $\tilde{\Omega}$ in view of Lemma 3. On another hand, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ defines a probability measure, since it clearly is a σ -finite measure, that is such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}[\Omega \times \mathcal{K}] = \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\Omega} \text{Card } \mathcal{H}] = \mathbf{P}[\text{Card } \mathcal{H} = c] = 1.$$

Now fix $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}[\tilde{\theta}^{-1}(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})] &= \int \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathbf{1}_{\theta^{-1}\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{(\varphi_{\omega})^{-1}(\mathcal{B})}(y) d\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\omega, y) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\theta^{-1}\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{H}_{\omega}} \mathbf{1}_{(\varphi_{\omega})^{-1}(\{x\})}(y) \right) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta^{-1}\omega}} \mathbf{1}_{(\varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega})^{-1}(\{x\})}(y) \right) d\mathbf{P}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

in view of the invariance of $\mathbf{P}$ under θ . But in view of Lemma 3, $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s., $x \in \mathcal{H}_{\omega}$ if and only if

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta^{-1}\omega}} \mathbf{1}_{(\varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega})^{-1}(\{x\})}(y) = \mathbf{1}_{(\varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega})^{-1}(\{x\})}(y_0) = 1,$$

where y_0 is the unique antecedent in $\mathcal{H}_{\theta^{-1}\omega}$ of x by $\varphi_{\theta^{-1}\omega}$. Hence the latter integral equals

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\omega}}(x) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}],$$

which shows that $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ is $\tilde{\theta}$ -invariant. $\square$

Finally, let $\tilde{X}$ (resp. $\tilde{\varphi}$) be the restriction on $\tilde{\Omega}$ of the r.v. $\bar{X}$ (resp. $\bar{\varphi}$) defined in the previous section, that is,

$$\tilde{X}(\omega, x) = x, \tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \text{a.s.},$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{\omega, x}(y) = \varphi_{\omega}(y) \text{ for all } y \in \mathbf{E}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \text{a.s..}$$

Then, as in (3),

$$\tilde{X} \circ \tilde{\theta} = \tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{X}), \tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \text{a.s.},$$

thus $\tilde{X}$ is a solution to (1) on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{\theta})$. We have proven the following result.

Theorem 2. *Under Hypothesis (H1) and (H2), there exists a stationary extension $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{\theta})$ of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \theta)$, given in Proposition 1, on which the equation (1) admits a solution $\tilde{X}$. Moreover, $\tilde{X}(\omega, x) \preceq Y(\omega)$ $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ -almost surely on $\tilde{\Omega}$.*

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Anantharam, V. and T. Konstantopoulos. Stationary solutions of stochastic recursions describing discrete time events systems. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **68**, 181–194, 1997.
- [2] V. Anantharam, V. and T. Konstantopoulos. A correction and some additional remarks on 'Stationary solutions of stochastic recursions describing discrete time events systems'. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **80**(2), 271–278, 1999.
- [3] F. Baccelli and P. Brémaud. *Elements of Queueing Theory* (2nd ed.). Springer, 2002.
- [4] A. A. Borovkov and S. Foss. Stochastic Recursive Sequences and their Applications. *Siberian Math. J.*, **2**(1), 16–81, 1992.
- [5] D. Flipo. Steady State of Loss Systems. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de Paris*, Ser. I, **297**(6), 1983.
- [6] B. Lisek. A method for Solving a Class of Recursive Stochastic Equation. *Zeitschrift für Wahrsch.*, **60**, 151–162, 1982.
- [7] R.M. Loynes. The stability of queues with non-independent interarrivals and service times. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, **58**, 497–520, 1962.
- [8] J. Neveu. Construction de files d'attente stationnaires. *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*, **60**, Springer-Verlag, 31–41, 1983.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES APPLIQUÉES DE COMPIÈGNE, UNIVERSITÉ DE TECHNOLOGIE DE COMPIÈGNE, DÉPARTEMENT GÉNIE INFORMATIQUE, CENTRE DE RECHERCHES DE ROYALLIEU, BP 20 529, 60 205 COMPIEGNE CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: moyalpas@dma.utc.fr